1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	CR No. 09-1193 MHP
14 15 16	v.)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT FROM APRIL 19, 2010 TO MAY 17, 2010
17 18	Defendant.	
19	On April 19, 2010, the parties in this case appeared before the Honorable Marilyn H. Patel	
20	for a status appearance. At that time, the parties stipulated that time should be excluded from the	
21	Speedy Trial Act calculation from April 19, 2010 to May 17, 2010 for effective preparation of	
22	defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance was for the reasonable	
23	time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of	
24	due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and (B)(iv).	
25	The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance	
26		
27		
28	Stipulation and [Proposed] Order CR No. 09-1193 MHP	

1	outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §	
2	3161(h)(7)(A).	
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED:	
4	JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO United States Attorney	
5	DATED 5/17/10	
6 7	DATED:/s/ ACADIA SENESE Special Assistant United States Attorney	
8	Special rissistant Cinies ritterney	
9	DATED:/s/ ELIZABETH FALK	
10	Attorney for Daniel A. Pesce	
11	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that time is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from April 19,	
12	2010 to May 17, 2010, under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
13	IT IS SO ORDERED	
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	DATED: 5/24/2010 IT IS SO ORDERED	
16	DATED: 5/24/2010 THE STORY	
17	Uhit Judge Marilyn H. Patel	
18 19		
20	THE OF SE	
21	DISTRICT OF	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		